





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,481	02/27/2002	Yuko Iwabuchi	29273/559	5826
23838	7590 04/22/2003			
KENYON & KENYON			· EXAMINER	
	ET, N.W., SUITE 700 ON, DC 20005		BERMAN	I, JACK I
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2881	
			DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/083,481	IWABUCHI ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jack I. Berman	2881	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	9SS
THE REPLY FILED 07 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper repl ch places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date o		a final rejection, whichever	ic later. In no
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverser, the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data are been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	ian SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Se 136(a) and the appropriate	ee MPEP
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	d statutory period for reply originally set in onths after the mailing date of the final rejo	the final Office action; or (2 ection, even if timely filed, n	2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	·		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	· · · —	•	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-13 and 16</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		Jack & Bornan	
		Jack I. Berman Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2881	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office



Continuation of 10. Other: For purposes of Appeal, amended claims 1, 4, and 9 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feuerbaum et al. for the reasons explained in the Office action mailed on June 5, 2002 (including the reason why Feuerbaum et al. inherently requires changing the magnitude of the retarding voltage based on the nature of the specimen). Amended claim 16 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feuerbaum et al. in view of Meisburger et al. for the reasons explained in that same Office action.